

In item 2 on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-8 have been rejected as being anticipated by Hiramatsu (US Pat. No. 5,180,901) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 5 call for, inter alia:

a support selected from the group consisting of board-shaped supports and foil-shaped supports, said support having electrically conductive regions connected to said sensor chip and to electrical connections of the smart card, said support having at least one opening formed therein, said sensor chip mounted on said support such that said active surface of said sensor chip is directed toward said support and situated in a region of said opening so that said active surface can be accessed through said opening.

Hiramatsu describes a chip card with integrated components, especially a sensor chip 1. The sensor chip 1 integrated in the card 10 in Fig. 1 is shown in detail in Figs. 4 and 5.

In contrast to the chip card module as recited in claim 1 and the smart card, which includes the chip card module, as recited in claim 5 of the invention of the instant

application, Hiramatsu only relates to a chip implanted in the card. The chip has chip electrodes 14 as shown in Fig. 5, which are brought outside the sensor chip (see column 5, lines 38-39) possibly for realizing a connection with an electrical connector.

A person skilled in the art cannot gather any hint from Hiramatsu that the chip disclosed therein concerns a chip card module with a chip and a support having electrically conductive regions on which the chip can be mounted. A contact of the chip with the electrical connections of the chip card through the support having the electrically conductive regions can therefore also not be realized. The silicon layer 15 in Hiramatsu cannot be interpreted as a support.

It is clear, especially from Fig. 2, that the focus of Hiramatsu is not on a special embodiment of a chip card module or a chip card. Rather, it is the object of Hiramatsu to realize an individual authentication function through the integration of the components as shown in Fig. 3 and their corresponding functionalities. The configuration of the integration of the components in the card is thus not important in Hiramatsu.

Clearly, Hiramatsu does not show a chip card module including a chip and a support having electrically conductive regions on which the chip can be mounted for realizing a contact of the chip with electrical connections of the chip card, as recited in claims 1 and 5 of the instant application.

Claims 1 and 5 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over Hiramatsu and since all of the dependent claims are dependent on claims 1 or 5, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the

Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,308



For Applicants

YHC:cgm

May 8, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101